DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 004 SP 005 998

AUTHOR Pritchard, Keith
TITLE Role Specialization of College Teachers of Education.
NOTE 34p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; *College Teachers; *Educational Research; Educational Researchers; *Job Satisfaction; Role Conflict; *Specialization; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

This report studies the role and degree of specialization existing among college teachers of education and the relationship of this specialization to rewards and sanctions administered by the institution, job satisfaction, institutional size, and age of the incumbents. Four hundred and twenty-six questionnaires were sent to all college teachers of education holding the rank of assistant professor or higher at eight institutions of higher learning. Four schools were in the Big Eight Conference, and the remaining four were located within the same states. Of the 264 returned questionnaires, 192 were found to be useable. Results indicated that subjects tended to specialize in their role performance. The researcher tended to achieve the highest level of job satisfaction while the administrator tended to be the most highly rewarded in terms of salary. The research, although it was not of a longitudinal nature, indicated that the youngest incumbents stressed the research role, the 50-59 year-old age group was more politically oriented and the 40-49 and 60-69 age group appeared to lack clear preference of type. Recommendations indicate a need for further study of role conflict. A seven-item bibliography is included. (MJM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 072004

Keith Pritchard

ROLE SPECIALIZATION OF COLLEGE TEACHERS OF EDUCATION

Few faculty members receive as much criticism or as many suggestions as to what they should properly be doing as those belonging to schools and departments of education. There are constant attempts to redefine the role of incumbents in the position. One has only to note the recent federally financed program for the re-training of teacher trainers (T-T-T) to appreciate the interest of the public in the role definition of college teachers of education.[1] There appears to be little consensus as to what the proper role is for incumbents of the position. In the past, large numbers have come into the profession after years of experience on the elementary and secondary school levels and have generally tended to view their role as primarily that of teacher. As schools of education have

---

[1]The Education Professions Development Act ties together a number of programs aimed at generally the same objective: the training and re-training of educational personnel. Since passage of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) in 1958, the Federal Government has had an increasing stake in the preparation of education personnel.

SP 005 918

increasingly granted the prestigious Ph.D. degree, the research role of college teachers of education has been emphasized also (Berelson, 1960:40). Unlike their colleagues in the liberal arts, college teachers of education are often called upon to translate educational theories into educational practices in the secondary and elementary schools. Thus, there is something of a public relations aspect to the role of college teacher of education (Chandler, et al., 1962:vi).

Heretofore the research has only tended to raise the question as to whether professors, in general, do differentiate in their role orientations and specialize in a particular role. Yamamoto and Dizney (1966:146) suggest that "on the basis of observation it seems that four rather distinct 'types' of faculty personnel exist." Their study specified the four types as administrator, socialite, teacher, and researcher (Yamamoto and Dizney, 1966:146). Knapp indicates in his research that the college professor in America has been asked to perform three quite different functions which he designates as (1) the research function, (2) the informational function, and (3) the character-developing function. Knapp (1962:291-292) observes that:

> Further, I submit at this juncture that although these functions have varied in emphasis in different times and circumstances, most of the paradoxes and most of the vicissitudes of the profession have resulted from the inherent difficulty of mixing these different performances. It is my thesis that the evolving role of the college professor in America has been characterized by a progressive decline of his character-developing function along with a strong tendency for the research and the informational functions to part company and form two separate callings.

Monson (1967:11-14) has analyzed the various aspects of the professor's role as that of scholar, consultant, teacher, and administrator. He suggests that much of the difficulty which incumbents experience in the position is a result of the difficulty of fulfilling equally each aspect of the professor's role. Gustad (1963:112-122) similarly suggests that the role may be divided into sub-roles; and he lists these as (1) individual, (2) teacher,

(3) scholar or researcher, (4) organization man, (5) member of academic community, and (6) member of the community at large.

Finally, Biddle and Thomas (1966:34-35), in projecting a theoretical framework for analysis of role specialization among professors, suggest that the role may possibly be divided into two basic divisions: (1) generalists, and (2) specialists. While specialist roles may be formed by differentiating the role into (1) teacher, (2) researcher, (3) administrator, and (4) service, it is possible that the incumbent may combine various role aspects and become a generalist.

The Problem and Procedure

The present paper concerns itself with (a) whether role specialization exists among incumbents of one particular academic position, that of college teachers of education and (b) if role specialization does exist, to what degree such specialization is related to (1) rewards and sanctions administered by the institution, (2) job satisfaction of incumbents of the position, (3) institutional size, and (4) the age of incumbents.

Through a review of the literature and extensive testing at the University of Nebraska, the role of college teachers of education was differentiated into four separate types in terms of their professional behavior. The first of these types was designated as that of teacher. It was theorized that if the incumbent tended to specialize in this role he would give priority in his professional actions to course preparation, teaching, evaluation, and student counseling. The second type was designated as researcher. In this instance it was speculated that if the incumbent specialized in this role he would give priority in his professional actions to manuscript writing and research, reading papers at national meetings, and using secretarial help for research purposes. The third type was designated as administrator. It was theorized that if the incumbent specialized in this role he would give priority in his professional behavior to working with committees, office management, clerical tasks, and dealing with departmental or institutional policies. The fourth type was designated as that of professional. It was speculated that if the incumbent tended to emphasize this role in his professional behavior, he would

give priority to seeking elective and appointive office in the professional organizations, representing his institution at statewide and national meetings, and speaking widely to various groups on educational matters. The professional role may be somewhat unique in that for college teachers of education there are more "professional" organizations to join than is true for college teachers in the other academic disciplines.[2]

In order to investigate whether college teachers of education do tend to specialize in one or more of the above types of role behavior, five questions were designed to elicit the incumbent's responses. The questions dealt

---

[2]It should be noted that the designation of role-type is based upon the subject's behavior, not upon his title. As a matter of fact, in the present study all subjects were employed as teaching staff. None was employed as administrative or research staff. Thus, role specialization in the present study refers to the types of particular behaviors in which an individual engages.

with the use of and/or relationship to (1) time, (2) space, (3) communications, (4) personnel, and (5) peer group. Respondents were asked to select a type of behavior used in the questionnaire that most closely resembled their own actions. For example, on the question of the use of time each respondent was asked to indicate how he spent the majority of his work time. Choices were (a) course work and student counseling, (b) research and writing, (c) preparing and organizing professional meetings, and (d) preparing and attending committee meetings within the employing institution. Thus, the respondent indicated on this and each of the other four questions his behavior and the degree to which he tended to specialize in one or possibly more of the four roles of the college teacher of education.

In the present paper, it was stipulated that should a subject be consistent in his role behavior, he would give top priority to the same role specialization in each of the structured situations included in the questionnaire. For example, the subject might indicate in each of the five situations in the questionnaire that he gave priority to the research role. Since there were five questions and each question contained the same four alternatives, a

consistent subject would have a role specialization score as follows:

R	P	A	T
5 (1X5)	10 (2X5)	15 (3X5)	20 (4X5)

The above response indicates that the subject consistently selected the research role as his first priority in all five questions; thus, a five was his priority score on the R or research role. He received a ten for his priority score on P or professional role; his priority scores on the A or administrator role and T or teacher role were obtained in a similar manner.

It was anticipated that the 192 subjects included in the present study would display a variation in their role specialization and that some would show equal preference for more than one specialization. Thus, not only would pure types of specializations be evident, but varieties of hybrid types as well. However, statistically each subject's score would have certain commonalities: (1) the total score for each subject would be 50; (2) the minimum priority or first choice score on any of the four role specialities would be 5; (3) the maximum priority score for any of the four roles would be 20; and (4) the role priority score of each subject could be presented in terms

of the four priority scores of the four specialities (T, R, A, and P).

A further question raised in the analysis of the data was the method by which the role specialization of the individual might be designated. For example, should the subject be described as T type, TR type, TRA type, or TRAP type? Because there were four types, the sum of permutations or combinations of taking one, two, three, or four types is 64. The writers decided on the following procedures. While five is the internal division for the ideal type, it was felt that should the internal division be as great as 3 this would sufficiently differentiate the various degrees of role specialization by the subject. In other words, if the interval between two roles was three or higher, the role with the smaller priority score was designated as a subject's type. If the first interval was less than three, the second interval was examined. If the second interval was three or higher, then the first two roles were combined and designated as the subject's type of specialization. Obviously, in this case the subject would be a hybrid type combining two specialities in his role behavior. If the third interval were three or higher, then the first three types were combined and designated as the subject's type or specialization. If the

third interval was less than three, then the subject was designated as a four item hybrid type. The following are examples from the sample of single and hybrid types:

Example 1 - a pure T type of role specialization

T	R	A	P
6	12	15	17

Example 2 - a TR or hybrid type of role specialization

T	R	A	P
7	8	17	18

Example 3 - a TRA or hybrid type of role specialization

T	R	A	P
9	10	12	19

The Sample

In the spring of 1969 questionnaires were sent to all college teachers of education holding the rank of assistant professor or higher at eight institutions of higher learning. Four of these were schools in the Big Eight Conference, and the remaining four were institutions of higher learning located within the same states. Thus, a comparison of institutional size and role specialization could be investigated. In selecting the institutions of higher learning for sampling, the following factors were considered: (1) selection was limited to state-supported

institutions; (2) there was a uniformity between institutions with regard to hiring procedures, promotional policies, and racial composition; (3) size of student body; (4) geographic locations; (5) library holdings in terms of total volumes; (6) school revenue; and (7) academic quality of freshman class as indicated by A.C.T. scores and academic standing in high school graduating class.

Four hundred and twenty-six questionnaires were sent out, and after one follow-up, 264 incumbents returned them. For the present study, 192 questionnaires were found to be useable. The sample used in the present study is composed of 47 professors, 58 associate professors, and 87 assistant professors. With respect to sex composition, the sample includes 170 males and 22 females. Twelve individuals in the sample were between twenty and twenty-nine years of age, seventy-nine were thirty to thirty-nine years of age, fifty-five were forty to forty-nine years of age, thirty-one were fifty to fifty-nine years of age, and fifteen were sixty to sixty-nine years of age.

The Results

The data in Table I indicate that subjects tended to specialize in certain major roles rather than combine various roles. In short, it appears that subjects tended to

specialize rather than generalize in their role performance. This tends to contrast sharply with much of the popular literature which suggests that the professor should emphasize a wide variety of roles in his work.

(Table I about here)

The fact that there were no four-item hybrid types in the study indicates the difficulty of functioning in several diverse roles within the profession. Thus, the percentage of hybrid types decreases as the degree of hybridization increases. Pure specialists or one-item types comprise 64.08 per cent of the sample, while the two-item hybrid types compose 23.43 per cent, and the three-item hybrid types make up only 12.5 per cent of the whole population. It appears that college teachers of education do not function in several diverse roles within the profession and that specialization has occurred here as within other professional and business areas.

The data from Table I further indicate that the role of teaching may be combined with many other roles. On the other hand the remaining three roles, research, administration, and professional, without combining in some manner the role of teaching, are very rare. While there may be pressure exerted upon college teachers of education to

TABLE I

ROLE SPECIALIZATION OF COLLEGE TEACHERS OF EDUCATION AT EIGHT MID-WESTERN INSTITUTIONS

Role Type	Number	Percentage
T (Teacher)	97	50.52
R (Researcher)	15	7.82
A (Administrator)	8	4.17
P (Professional)	3	1.57
Totals for one-item types	123	64.08
TR (Teacher-Researcher)	13	6.77
TA (Teacher-Administrator)	11	5.73
TP (Teacher-Professional)	8	4.17
RT (Researcher-Teacher)	9	4.69
AP (Administrator-Professional)	3	1.57
PT (Professional-Teacher)	1	.50
Totals for two-item types	45	23.43
TRA	1	.52
TRP	2	1.05
TAR	1	.52
TAP	1	.52
TPR	2	1.05
TPA	2	1.05
RTP	2	1.05

TABLE I (Continued)

Role Type	Number	Percentage
RPT	1	.52
RPA	2	1.05
ATR	2	1.05
ATP	1	.52
ART	1	.52
APT	1	.52
PTA	4	2.09
PRT	1	.52
Totals for three-item types	24	12.50

do research, only 7.82 per cent of the individuals in the sample indicate that they specialize in this area.

Since the two-item and three-item types indicate that the difference between the items is not significant enough to distinguish one role from the other, the two-item hybrids containing the same types such as TR and RT were combined into a single group for more complete analysis. The same procedure was applied to three-item hybrid types such as TAR, ART, and RTA, etc. Through this procedure, it was possible to narrow the role specializations represented in the sample to twelve types.

Table II contains an analysis of the role specializations of the total sample by groupings. The table indicates not only the percentages of the population who specialize as pure types such as the one-item pure T type, but, in addition, all of the hybrid types which have T in the combination. Similar procedure is employed with the other three role types and their related hybrids. Thus, Table II presents the percentages of the population of T types vs. no T types, R types vs. no R types, A types vs. no A types, and P types vs. no P types. Through such an analysis it is possible to discover what proportion of the sample specializes in the T type role either as a pure T type or as a hybrid T type. The same has been done for the other three types of role specialization.

(Table II about here)

Analysis of the data contained in Table II indicates that the T or teacher role, either in the pure form or hybrid form of specialization, is practiced by 83.85 per cent of the total population. Thirty-one of the 192 subjects, or 16.15 per cent of the total sample, do not emphasize the teaching role to any measurable extent. This latter group appears to function in areas other than that of teacher. Each of the three remaining role areas of specialization or its combinations is played by a minority of the total population: research type equals 27.08 per cent; administrator type 19.8 per cent; and professional type 17.71 per cent. Thus, as might be expected, a large majority of the college teachers of education in the sample do indicate that in the area of role behavior they act to a high degree as teacher types. This gives rise to additional questions which the writers have attempted to examine in the present paper:

(a) Which of the twelve types are better rewarded in terms of salary within the faculties of schools and departments of education?

(b) Which of the twelve types expresses the greatest job satisfaction?

TABLE II

ROLE SPECIALIZATION OF COLLEGE TEACHERS OF EDUCATION BY TYPE GROUPINGS

Role Type	Number	Percentage
T (Teacher) Groupings		
Pure T type	97	50.52
2 Item Hybrid T	42	21.87
3 Item Hybrid T	22	11.46
Total T and T Combinations	161	83.85
Total for no T in Combination	31	16.15
R (Researcher) Groupings		
Pure R Type	15	7.81
2 Item Hybrid R	22	11.46
3 Item Hybrid R	15	7.81
Total R and R Combinations	52	27.08
Total for no R in Combination	140	72.92
A (Administrator) Groupings		
Pure A Type	8	4.17
2 Item Hybrid A	14	7.30
3 Item Hybrid A	16	8.33
Total A and A Combinations	38	19.80
Total for no A in Combination	154	80.21
P (Professional) Groupings		
Pure P Type	3	1.56
2 Item Hybrid P	12	6.25
3 Item Hybrid P	19	9.90
Total P and P Combinations	34	17.71
Total for no P in Combination	158	82.29

(c) Are there major differences in the distribution of role types among the teaching faculties of the eight institutions represented in the present sample?

(d) Is there a tendency for particular age groupings of faculty members to contain differential role types?

Salary and Role Specialization

Table III indicates that of the average salary of the four pure one-item types of role specialization, A or administrator type has the highest average salary ($17,062) for the nine-month academic period. On the other hand, the T or teacher type has the lowest salary, with an average of $12,061 for the same period. In descending order, the salaries of the pure types are as follows: (1) administrator, (2) professional, (3) researcher, and (4) teacher. One might, therefore, speculate that among the two-item types certain specializations would also draw higher salaries than others. On the basis of the salary rankings of pure types, one would suggest that the following types in the two-item hybrid groups should receive salaries in descending order as follows: (1) administrator-professional, (2) teacher-administrator, (3) teacher-professional,

and (4) teacher-researcher. Examination of Table III indicates that the actual order is as follows: (1) administrator-professional ($16,166), (2) teacher-administrator ($13,318), (3) teacher-researcher ($12,818), and (4) teacher-professional ($12,111).

(Table III about here)

Following the same logic, one would suggest that among the three-item hybrid types it would be found that those combinations containing no teacher or T type, such as RPA in any combination, would have the highest salary, followed by combinations containing no R, no P, and no A. Examination of Table III indicates the following: (1) no T in any combination receives an average salary as high as $16,750; (2) no R in any combination receives an average salary of $14,833; (3) no P in any combination receives an average salary of $13,800; and (4) no A in any combination receives an average salary of $13,375. The data indicate that the presence of T or teacher role is a low salary indicator, while the presence of A or administrator role is an indicator of high salary with P or professional role and R or researcher role falling in between the two extremes. It is obvious that of the above speculations on role specialization and the relationship of salary among

TABLE III

THE DISTRIBUTION OF SALARY BY TYPE OF ROLE SPECIALIZATION

Role Type	Salary $8,500 (7-10)	$11,000 (10-12)	$13,000 (12-14)	$15,000 (14-17)	$18,500 (17-20)	$20,000+ (20+)		Average
T	110,500 (13)	440,000 (40)	364,000 (28)	180,000 (12)	55,500 (3)	20,000 (1)	97	12,061
R		22,000 (2)	78,000 (6)	45,000 (3)	37,000 (2)	40,000 (2)	15	14,800
A			26,000 (2)	15,000 (1)	55,500 (3)	40,000 (2)	8	17,062
P				30,000 (2)	18,500 (1)		3	16,166
TR & RT	8,500 (1)	110,000 (10)	65,000 (5)	60,000 (4)	18,500 (1)	20,000 (1)	22	12,818
TA		33,000 (3)	65,000 (5)	30,000 (2)	18,500 (1)		11	13,318
TP & PT		44,000 (4)	65,000 (5)				9	12,111
AP				30,000 (2)	18,500 (1)		3	16,166
No P TRA TAR ATR ART	17,000 (2)			15,000 (1)	37,000 (2)		5	13,800
No A TRP TPR RTP RPT PRT		44,000 (4)	13,000 (1)	30,000 (2)		20,000 (1)	8	13,375
No R TAP TPA ATP APT PTA		11,000 (1)	39,000 (3)	45,000 (3)	18,500 (1)	20,000 (1)	9	14,833
No T RPA				15,000 (1)	18,500 (1)		2	16,750

the two-item and three-item hybrids only one, that of TP and TR, is incorrect.

(Table IV about here)

Table IV indicates the actual order of the twelve existing types of role specialization in terms of the respective salary earnings. The order is generally in accord with the aforementioned predictive principles. For example, the pure one item T or teacher type earns the least amount of salary. The hybrid TR or teacher-researcher type earns more than TP or teacher-professional although the P is a higher salary indicator than is R. On the other hand, the one item A type or administrator should earn the highest salary without the contamination of lower salary indicators. Table IV indicates this is true.

To a very large degree the salary indicators in the order of A-->P-->R--> and T suggest that teaching, while being the dominant role for college teachers of education, is the least rewarding in terms of salary. The presence of heavy emphasis on teacher role by an incumbent indicates low salary, and the absence of emphasis on the teacher role indicates high salary. The administrator type of specialization, while engaged in by a relatively few individuals in the sample, is the most highly rewarded role in terms of salary.

TABLE IV

ROLE SPECIALIZATION OF COLLEGE TEACHERS OF EDUCATION AND NINE MONTH SALARIES

Type	Rank for Salary	Salary
A	1	$17,062
No T	2	$16,750
AP	3	$16,166
P	4	$16,166
No R	5	$14,833
R	6	$14,800
No P	7	$13,800
No A	8	$13,375
TA	9	$13,318
TR	10	$12,818
TP	11	$12,111
T	12	$12,061

Job Satisfaction and Role Specialization

In further analysis the writers attempted to examine the relationship between job satisfaction levels and role specialization of college teachers of education. In this instance job satisfaction was measured as a unidimensional factor. Incumbents in the sample were asked to express the degree of satisfaction they felt with various aspects of the job, career, and work. They were presented with fourteen questions and given five degrees of freedom, ranging from very satisfied to very dissatisfied, with which to answer the questions. Thus, an incumbent who expressed the minimum amount of job satisfaction would receive a score of fourteen, and an incumbent who expressed the maximum amount of job satisfaction would receive a score of seventy.

(Table V about here)

From the findings presented in Table V, it will be noted that the average job satisfaction score is forty-seven. The writers assumed that where the average score was fifty or higher, this could be used as an indicator of high job satisfaction. Table VI represents the ranking of role specialization according to levels of job satisfaction. It is obvious that the presence of teacher role

TABLE V

JOB SATISFACTION SCORES BY ROLE SPECIALIZATION

Role Type	Job Satisfaction Scores												Totals
	Low 1-9		10-19		20-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		High 60-69		
T					5	5%	17	17%	40	41%	33	34%	2	2%	97
R							2	13%	6	40%	6	40%	1	7%	15
A							1	12.5%	4	50%	2	25%	1	12.5%	8
P									1	33%	2	67%			3
TR & RT							5	23%	12	55%	4	18%	1	4%	22
TA							3	27%	7	64%	1	9%			11
TP & PT							2	20%	4	40%	3	30%	1	10%	10
AP									2	67%	1	33%			3
No P TRA, TAR, ATR, ART							2	40%	1	20%	2	40%			5
No A TRP, TPR, RTP, RPT, PRT									3	37.5%	5	62.5%			8
No R TAP, TPA, ATP, APT, PTA							3	37.5%	2	25%	3	37.5%			8
No T RPA											2	100%			2

(Table VI about here)

specialization tends to act as an indicator of low job satisfaction. P or professional type role specialization and R or research type role specialization act as indicators of high level job satisfaction, followed by A or administrator type role specialization. Thus, the ranking order of role types according to job satisfaction is not the same as that of role types according to salary levels. R or researcher type ranks third in salary earnings but first or second in job satisfaction scales. It is ironic that while teaching specialization is often proclaimed to be the major role for college professors of education, it is the only role area that seems to be consistently low both in terms of salary and in terms of job satisfaction.

Size of Institution and Role Specialization

In examining the relationship between role specialization of college teachers of education and size of institutions, the writers raised the question as to whether larger institutions tend to have present on their faculties larger numbers of certain role specializations than do smaller institutions. Schools number 1, 2, 3, and 4 were selected due to the fact that they are the largest state universities in their respective states. Their

TABLE VI

RANKING OF ROLE TYPES OF COLLEGE TEACHERS OF EDUCATION ACCORDING TO JOB SATISFACTION SCORES

Type	Ranking	Per Cent of High Job Satisfaction Scores
No T	1	100
P	2	66
No A	3	62
R	4	47
TP and PT	5	40
No P	6	40
A	7	37
No R	8	37
T	9	36
AP	10	33
TR and RT	11	22
TA	12	9

annual budgets exceed those of any other institutions of higher learning in their states, and their student enrollments are the largest of any such institutions. Schools number 5, 6, 7, and 8 were selected from the same corresponding states; however, they had relatively small student enrollments and low budgetary allowances. In short, the second group represent the state colleges, whereas, the former grouping represents the state universities. However, schools number 5 and 7 do possess greater numbers of faculty members in education than do certain of the larger state universities.

Table VII indicates that except for school number 7, larger institutions generally entertain more varieties of role types than the smaller institutions. It may be noted also that state college number 7 not only exceeds university number 4 in variety of role types but also in the number of college teachers of education.

(Table VII about here)

The second conclusion that can be drawn from Table VII is that in all the smaller institutions or state colleges the pure T or teacher type of specialists constitutes more than 50 per cent of the total faculty, while none of the state universities has a pure T type of over 50 per cent. To the contrary, the state universities have

TABLE VII

ROLE SPECIALIZATION AND SIZE OF INSTITUTION

Role Type	School 1	School 2	School 3	School 4	School 5	School 6	School 7	School 8	Total
T	15 46%	15 47%	22 40%	4 34%	11 79%	9 90%	15 55%	6 60%	97
R	1 3%	4 13%	6 11%	2 17%	0	0	1 4%	1 10%	15
A	3 9%	1 3%	2 4%	1 8%	1 7%	0	0	0	8
P	1 3%	1 3%	1 2%	0	0	0	0	0	3
TR & RT	4 12%	5 16%	6 11%	3 25%	0	1 10%	2 7%	1 10%	22
TA	1 3%	0	3 6%	1 8%	2 14%	0	4 15%	0	11
TP & PT	4 12%	2 6%	1 2%	0	0	0	1 4%	1 10%	9
AP	0	1 3%	1 2%	1 8%	0	0	0	0	3
No P TRA TAR ATR ART	1 3%	0	2 4%	0	0	0	1 4%	1 10%	5
No A TRP TPR RTP RPT PRT	2 6%	1 3%	5 9%	0	0	0	0	0	8
No R TAP TPA ATP APT PTA	1 3%	2 6%	3 5%	0	0	0	3 11%	0	9
No T RPA	0	0	2 4%	0	0	0	0	0	2
Totals	33 100%	32 100%	54 100%	12 100%	14 100%	10 100%	27 100%	10 100%	129

more no-T types than do the state colleges. The existence of the P or professional type, especially the pure P type, seems to be a distinctive trait of the large state universities. Another interesting conclusion that may be drawn from the data contained in Table VII is that state university faculties seem to display a greater percentage of individuals whose role orientations tend to be directed toward research than is found among the smaller state institutions. Including both pure and hybrid types, the largest percentage of R or research types produced in the state colleges is 20 per cent; whereas, the smallest percentage of R types to be found in the large state institutions is 24 per cent.

Age of Incumbents and Role Specialization

The final relationship to be examined in the present paper is that between role specialization of college teachers of education and age of the incumbents. The writers were concerned as to whether younger men and women who enter the profession tend to reflect different role specializations than do those who are older. Is it possible that role specialization is a function of the age grouping into which the incumbent falls and that role specializations evolve and modify as the incumbent ages and his career changes?

(Table VIII about here)

As indicated in Table VIII, the largest age groups in our sample are 30-39 and 40-49. In comparing each age group with others with regard to the four basic role specializations and possible combinations, the writers found some age groups to be unique in their role specializations. Table IX shows most interestingly that the youngest age group, 20-29, ranks first in both the numbers of incumbents indicating their role type to be R or research type and P or professional type; whereas, they are last in the numbers of A or administrative types included in the age grouping. However, the teacher type still has the largest percentage, 84.7 per cent, followed by R (53.9 per cent), P (30.8 per cent), and A (7.7 per cent).

(Table IX about here)

The 30-39 year age group tends to specialize somewhat differently with its order of priority being T, R, A, and P. This particular group appears to fulfill what one might expect to be the public's demands on role types and behavior. The 40-49 year age group shows no distinctive role specialization trends in comparison with other age groups.

TABLE VIII

ROLE SPECIALIZATION BY AGE

Role Type	Age										Totals
	20-29 years		30-39 years		40-49 years		50-59 years		60 years +		
T	5	38.46%	41	51.25%	28	52.83%	16	51.61%	7	46.67%	97
R	2	15.38%	7	8.75%	3	5.66%	1	3.23%	2	13.33%	15
A			1	1.25%	4	7.55%	2	6.45%	1	6.67%	8
P					1	1.89%	2	6.45%			3
TR & RT	1	7.69%	13	16.25%	5	9.43%	2	6.45%	1	6.67%	22
TA			4	5.00%	5	9.43%	2	6.45%			11
TP & PT	1	7.69%	4	5.00%	1	1.89%	1	3.23%	2	13.33%	9
AP			1	1.25%			2	6.45%			3
No P TRA TAR ATR ART	1	7.69%	2	2.50%			2	6.45%			5
No A TRP TPR RTP PRT RPT	3	23.08%	3	3.75%	1	1.89%			1	6.67%	8
No R TAP TPA ATP APT PTA			3	3.75%	4	7.55%	1	3.23%	1	6.67%	9
No T RPA			1	1.25%	1	1.89%					2
Totals	13	100%	80	100%	53	100%	31	100%	15	100%	192

TABLE IX

A COMPARISON OF ROLE SPECIALIZATION AND AGE GROUPINGS OF COLLEGE TEACHERS OF EDUCATION

Role Type	Age Groupings				
	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69
T (Pure and Hybrid)	84.7%	87.7%	82.9%	77.5%	80.1%
No T	15.3%	12.3%	17.1%	22.5%	19.9%
R (Pure and Hybrid)	53.9%	32.7%	18.9%	16.2%	26.7%
No R	46.1%	67.3%	81.1%	83.8%	73.3%
A (Pure and Hybrid)	7.7%	15.2%	26.3%	29.2%	13.4%
No A	92.3%	84.8%	78.7%	71.8%	86.6%
P (Pure and Hybrid)	30.8%	15.2%	15.1%	22.7%	26.7%
No P	69.2%	84.8%	84.9%	77.3%	73.3%

The incumbents of the 50-59 year age group are unique in that they tend to display a strong trend toward giving priority to the A or administrative type role in comparison to other age groups. Likewise, they display a low interest in both T or teacher role and R or research role. The percentage order of preference for this age group is T, A, P, and R. The oldest age group, 60-69 years of age, shows no uniqueness in role specialization in comparison to other age groups. Percentagewise, its order of priority is T, R, P, and A.

Summary and Conclusions

The data of the study show quite clearly that college teachers of education do tend to specialize to a high degree in their role behavior. While there is some evidence of incumbents combining two or more major roles in their professional behavior, the vast majority tend to restrict themselves to a single role. While the sample shows a high degree of orientation toward the teacher role, this particular area of specialization tends to be less rewarding in terms of salary and job satisfaction than do other types. In addition, the teacher type is employed to a larger extent at smaller and less prestigious institutions than are other types. The data of the study further reveal that the researcher type does not receive the

highest salary; however, his level of job satisfaction is relatively high. The administrator type and professional type tend to be the most highly rewarded groups in terms of salary. They also seem to be the fixture of larger institutions.

A question which the writers have only partially explored and one that needs greater attention is that of the relationship of age to role specialization. Does there exist a progression of role specialities for incumbents, and is there a possibility that some proceed in the course of their career from teacher type to researcher type to administrator type and finally to professional type? Our study shows that the youngest incumbents are strong in stressing the research role while the 50-59 year old age group is more politically oriented than other age groups. The 40-49 year age group and the 60-69 year age group appear to lack clear preference of type. There appears to be some indication that roles may shift somewhat; however, since the present study is not of a longitudinal nature greater research information is needed.

Above all, this study raises the question of how we can deal with what appears to constitute the basis of serious role conflict existing within faculties of education, namely that a majority of the incumbents are oriented

toward teaching, yet at the same time, this role behavior is not especially rewarded in terms of salary or job satisfaction. It appears that the administrations of institutions of higher learning have intentionally over the years been pressing, knowingly and unknowingly, for role specialization in the areas of research and administrative work while the vast majority of the incumbents in teachers colleges and schools of education continue to adhere to the teaching role. This presumed pressure on the part of the administration may be a result of the drive to enhance the prestige and status of such departments and colleges. While the present paper does not deal directly with role conflict, it does suggest that further investigation is much needed in the area. While it is merely speculation, the question of role specialization and negative and positive sanctions on role specialization for incumbents within schools of education may in part account for much of the confusion and irritation often found in this academic sector. It is interesting to note Parson's thoughts on the matter. "Furthermore, (role) conflict may create personal confusion, anxiety, and ambivalence for the individual, to say nothing of the many possible dysfunctions of the conflict." (Biddle and Thomas, 1966:273)

REFERENCES

Berelson, Bernard.
1960 Graduate Education in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Biddle, Bruce J., and Edwin J. Thomas.
1966 Role Theory: Concepts and Research. New York: Wiley.

Chandler, B. J., et al.
1962 Education in Urban Society. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company.

Gustad, John W.
1963 "The Compleat Academician." The Record 65 (November):112-122.

Knapp, Robert H.
1962 "Changing Functions of the College Professor." Pp. 291-292 in Nevitt Sanford (ed.), The American College. New York: Wiley.

Monson, Charles H., Jr.
1967 "Professor's Four Faces." AAUP Bulletin 53 (March):11-14.

Yamamoto, K., and H. F. Dizney.
1966 "Eight Professors - A Study on College Students' Preferences Among Their Teachers." Journal of Educational Psychology 57 (June):146.